1886MNRAS..46..340F

In conclusion, while I consider that the evidence is tolerably strong against the period of this binary being only some 76 years, I by no means assert that the time of revolution is precisely 87·438 years. I hold that several years of observation will be required to fix quite accurately the values of P, τ, and e; but, from the annexed Table, I think it is evident that in six or eight years, if careful measures be taken, the point will be settled as to whether the period is about 76 years or exceeds 86 years.

Epoch.	Downing-Elkin Orbit.		Orbit now submitted.	
	P.	*d.*	P.	*d.*
	°	″	°	″
1886·275	202·61	14·89	201·74	15·04
1889·275	205·16	17·70	204·10	18·30
1892·275	207·11	19·52	205·82	20·68
1895·275	208·79	20·54	207·24	22·33
1898·275	210·37	20·91	208·49	23·39
1901·275	211·93	20·74	209·65	23·93

Hampstead: April 1886.

The Magnitude of η Argûs in March 1886.

By W. H. Finlay, M.A.

I have examined the magnitudes of the stars in the neighbourhood of *η Argûs*, and compared them amongst themselves on several occasions recently, with the following result:—

The letters used to denote the stars are those given by Sir John Herschel on pp. 44–46 of his "Results of Astronomical Observations at the Cape of Good Hope." My observations for the magnitude of *Eta* (A) are

$$A\begin{cases} = \mathrm{F} \\ = \mathrm{F} \\ \text{slightly} < \mathrm{F}\end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} < \mathrm{O} \\ < \mathrm{O}\end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} > \kappa' \\ = \kappa'\end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} > \mathrm{C} \\ \tfrac{1}{2}\ \text{mag.} > \mathrm{C}\end{cases} \quad \begin{cases}\text{slightly} < \beta.\end{cases}$$

I also note β *very* slightly $<\lambda$.

The magnitudes of these stars, as given by Herschel himself and by Gould in the Cordoba Catalogue, are

	Herschel.	Gould.
F	8	8
O	7	7½
κ'	8	8
C	8	—
β	8	7½
λ	7	7½

whence η is not very different from 7½ magnitude.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ by guest on August 12, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System

1886MNRAS..46..340F

The stars F, β and λ, however, are among those whose magnitudes were specially determined by Gould for comparison with η (*cf. Uranometria Argentina*, p. 256), and they are there given as 7·60, 7·48, and 7·44 respectively. As they have maintained their relative magnitudes, we may assume the actual magnitudes to be still the same; and my observations, therefore, make the magnitude of η *Argûs* at the present time very approximately

7·6

in Gould's scale of magnitudes.

Royal Observatory, Cape of Good Hope:
1886, *March* 16.

The Nebulæ in the Pleiades. By A. A. Common.

The photograph of a part of the *Pleiades*, by MM. Henry, referred to in their letter to Mr. Knobel in the last number of the *Notices* of the Society, is very interesting. That MM. Henry set out with the intention of photographing the nebula near *Merope*, that is so well known, may be taken for granted; that they should evidently fail to get this, and get evidence of three separate nebulæ all near bright stars, only one of which can be said to have been certainly seen before, this being the same one near *Merope* that I found with the 3-foot Reflector in 1880 (*Monthly Notices*, April 1880), is very remarkable, and is due to the greater power of the photographic method over the eye in recording the presence of a faint light in the neighbourhood of a bright one.

On referring to my note of the observation of the small nebula near *Merope*, I have said: "There is strong suspicion in my mind of more nebula here," and I mention, "a similar appearance elsewhere" to that of this nebula. This I believe alluded to an observation of the Maia nebula which will be doubtless easily seen in the 3-foot telescope, and was the cause of the observation in the last paragraph of my note, where I say there is a great deal yet to be settled as to the extent and number of the nebulæ in this cluster.

Whether the fainter well-known nebula can be photographed with a telescope so small as that used by MM. Henry remains to be seen. There is an extremely small amount of light available, the light of this nebula being, I believe, not so bright as the zodiacal light at a considerable elevation, whilst the faintest trace of skylight quite obliterates it. Observations made at this time of year would, I feel sure, render it very doubtful if this nebula could be seen with any aperture, and it may be that this would account for it not being seen by some observers who have only looked for it at this time of the year.

Downloaded from http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/ by guest on August 12, 2015

© Royal Astronomical Society • Provided by the NASA Astrophysics Data System